

Attachment

Initial Study Checklist

1 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Diamond Pet Foods Project
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Ripon, 259 N. Wilma Avenue, Ripon, CA 95366
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Ken Zuidervaart, Planning Director, (209) 599-2108
4. Project Location: 942 S. Stockton Avenue, Ripon, CA 95366
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Diamond Pet Foods, Inc., 250 Roth Road, Lathrop, CA 95330
6. General Plan Designation: Heavy Industrial (HI)
7. Zoning: M2 (Heavy Industrial) and RC (Resource Conservation)
8. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Diamond Pet Foods, Inc. proposes to add a fourth production line to its existing facility in the City of Ripon. All expansion would be within the existing physical structure of its production plant. See the preceding Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a more detailed project description.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings) The project site is bounded by industrial uses to the north, State Route (SR) 99 to the east, the Stanislaus River to the south, and undeveloped land to the west. Oak Grove Park is located to the southwest and residential areas are located further to the north, on either side of SR 99.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement) See the preceding NOP.
11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun? *Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.*

See Section 1.18 of this Initial Study.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology / Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use / Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population / Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation / Traffic
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- None With Mitigation

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Ken Zuidervaart

Printed Name

City of Ripon

Agency

11/13/18

Date

Planning Director

Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

1.1 AESTHETICS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.1.1 Environmental Setting

Aesthetic resources are generally defined as both the natural and built features of the landscape that contribute to the public’s experience and appreciation of the environment. Depending on the extent to which a project’s presence would negatively alter the perceived visual character and quality of the environment, aesthetic impacts may occur.

The Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility is located in an industrial area within the City of Ripon, in San Joaquin County. It is bounded by industrial uses to the north, State Route (SR) 99 to the east, the Stanislaus River to the south, and undeveloped land to the west. Oak Grove Park is located to the southwest and residential areas are located further to the north, on either side of SR 99. There are no designated scenic routes in the *City of Ripon General Plan* (2006a), and the closest scenic routes identified in the *San Joaquin County General Plan* (1992) are located sufficiently distant from the project site (Austin Road is located approximately three miles west of the project site, and River Road is located approximately two miles northeast of the project site). Sensitive viewers near the project site include motorists along SR 99 and visitors at Oak Grove Park.

1.1.2 Discussion

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No impact. A scenic vista is generally considered a view of an area that has remarkable scenery or a resource that is indigenous to the area. The project site does not contain any aesthetic resources that would be considered a scenic vista. The project site includes the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility surrounded by industrial land. From SR 99, the project site is not distinctive from other industrial development in the viewshed. Numerous buildings and other structures dot the horizon, and the Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility blends in to this landscape. The new equipment would be installed inside the facility and would not be visible to the public. Because the project would not adversely affect a scenic vista, there would be **no impact**.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No impact. The project would not be located near a designated or eligible state scenic highway (Caltrans 2011). Furthermore, the project would not damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

No impact. See discussion under a) above. The project would be located in an industrial area. The new equipment would be installed inside the facility and would not be visible to the public. Therefore, the project would not change the visual character or quality of the site. There would be **no impact**.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No impact. Glare is caused by light reflections from pavement, water, vehicles, and building materials such as reflective glass and polished surfaces. During daylight hours, the amount of glare depends on the intensity and direction of sunlight. At night, artificial light can cause glare. The project would not include the addition of new lighting fixtures, beyond the existing security lighting of the facility, which are directed downward, and screened to avoid nighttime lighting spillover effects on adjacent land uses and nighttime sky conditions. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

1.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Agriculture and Forest Resources.				
<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997, as updated) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</p>				
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.2.1 Environmental Setting

The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program classifies agricultural land in eight categories based on soil quality and irrigation status. The project site is located in an industrial area. There is no farmland in the project area.

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly referred to as the Williamson Act, enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of preserving agriculture and restricting unnecessary conversion to urban uses. Under the contract, landowners receive reduced property tax assessments

based on the property's value for farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. There is no farmland in the project area, and neither the project site nor surrounding sites are under a Williamson Act contract.

No forest land or timberland is located within or adjacent to the project site.

1.2.2 Discussion

- a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No impact. The project would be located in and near an operational industrial land use. The project site is not on or adjacent to farmland; therefore, the project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use. **No impact** would occur.

- b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?**

No impact. The project would not be located on or adjacent to farmland or land associated with a Williamson Act contract; therefore, the project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. **No impact** would occur.

- c) **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

No impact. The project site is designated for Heavy Industrial land uses. There is no existing zoning for forest land within the project area, nor is the site forested. The project area is already developed with industrial facilities. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- d) **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

No impact. The project site is not forested. Therefore, no forest lands would be lost or converted to non-forest uses as a result of the project. **No impact** would occur.

- e) **Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

No impact. Indirect impacts on agricultural lands can occur in two ways: (1) by urban development increasing property values, or extending infrastructure, thereby placing pressure on adjacent agricultural lands to convert to non-agricultural uses; or (2) through land use conflicts between the proposed use and the agricultural use leading eventually to the diminishment of the agricultural use (for example, reduction of viable cropland in response to crop-dusting-related complaints from a new adjacent subdivision).

The project would not be located on or adjacent to farmland or forest land; therefore, the project would not convert farmland or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use, or otherwise result in such conversion. **No impact** would occur.

1.3 AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. Air Quality.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations.				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.3.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is in the City of Ripon, which lies within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD). With respect to ozone, SJVAB is currently designated nonattainment for the 1-hour ozone California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) and for the 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) (CARB 2017). SJVAB is designated as nonattainment for the state PM₁₀ (i.e., respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less) CAAQS and attainment for the national PM₁₀ NAAQS, and the SJVAB is designated as nonattainment for the PM_{2.5} (i.e., fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less) CAAQS and NAAQS (CARB 2015).

Air quality within San Joaquin County is regulated by such agencies as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California Air Resources Board (CARB) at the federal and State levels, respectively, and locally by the SJVAPCD. SJVAPCD seeks to improve air quality conditions in the SJVAB through a comprehensive program of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation, and promotion of the understanding of air quality issues. SJVAPCD’s clean air strategy includes the development of programs for the attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations, and issuance of permits for stationary sources. SJVAPCD also inspects stationary sources, responds to citizen complaints, monitors ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, and implements other programs and regulations required by the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA), and the California Clean Air Act (CCAA).

SJVAPCD has developed plans to attain CAAQS and NAAQS for ozone and particulate matter. The air quality plans include emissions inventories to measure the sources of air pollutants, to evaluate how well different control methods have worked and to show how air pollution will be reduced. The plans also use computer modeling to estimate future levels of pollution and make sure that the SJVAB will meet air quality goals.

1.3.2 Discussion

a, b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Potentially significant. The project would include construction activities and would expand the operation of the existing pet food production facility by 33 percent. This would result in increased fuel and energy use, which would result in increased emission of stationary-source air pollutants. The increased operation would also increase vehicle trips associated with truck deliveries and worker commute trips. This would also generate additional air pollutant emissions. The level of air pollutants generated by the project is currently unknown, and further analysis is required. This impact would be **potentially significant**, and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Potentially significant. As described under the response to a,b) above, the project would result in an increase in stationary- and mobile-source air pollutant emissions. The level of air pollutants generated by the project is currently unknown, and further analysis is required to determine whether the project would result in a cumulative net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the SJVAB is in non-attainment. This impact would be **potentially significant**, and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Potentially significant. The nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 1,500 feet east of the site. The project involves expansion of an industrial use, which may result in increased emission of toxic air contaminants (TACs) associated with the additional equipment and production capacity, as well as the additional truck trips. Technical analysis is necessary to determine the potential for increase in TACs and whether existing sensitive receptors could be exposed to a substantial increase. This impact would be **potentially significant**, and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Potentially significant. A residential neighborhood is located east of the facility across SR 99 (the nearest home is 1,500 feet from the proposed installation area), and odor has been an issue for the facility since the beginning of its operation. A new RTO system is currently being installed to reduce odor. However, given the history of odor issues associated with the facility, additional analysis is necessary to determine whether an increase in odor associated with the proposed operational expansion would be adequately abated by the new RTO system, such that a substantial number of people would not be affected by the proposed expansion. This impact would be **potentially significant**, and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Biological Resources. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.4.1 Environmental Setting

The project site is located in an industrial area, at the existing Diamond Pet Food Processing Facility in the City of Ripon. The factory is located adjacent to a field and south of the Stanislaus River. The nearest riparian habitat consists of trees along the riverbank. The undisturbed areas along the edges of fields and orchards are home to game birds, small animals, and rodents (City of Ripon 2006a). The riverbanks of the Stanislaus River are home to several sensitive species including: elderberry longhorn beetle, riparian woodrat, riparian brush rabbit, western yellow billed cuckoo, and delta button celery. The *City of Ripon General Plan (2006a)* policy does not allow for new buildings in the Stanislaus River’s 100-year flood plain except by special permit. This project would place new equipment in an existing building and the project site is not located within the 100-year floodplain.

The San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP) (San Joaquin Council of Governments 2000), provides a strategy for balancing the conservation of open space, the agricultural economy, and the long-term management of special-status plant, fish, and wildlife species. The SJMSCP covers 97 species in 52 vegetative communities throughout San Joaquin County. The plan provides comprehensive mitigation, in compliance with federal and local regulations, for impacts of SJMSCP-permitted activities on these species. The City of Ripon is a permittee of the SJMSCP and has opted for coverage under the SJMSCP for incidental take of covered species associated with future urban growth within the City's service area. As such, it is required to mitigate for the conversion of agricultural habitat lands and natural lands through in-lieu fees, habitat land dedication, purchase of mitigation bank credits, or by proposing an alternative mitigation plan consistent with the goals of the SJMSCP. The project site is designated as Category A/No Pay Zone in the SJMSCP. It is considered urban land already converted from open space.

1.4.2 Discussion

- a) **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No Impact. The project would be located at the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility. The new equipment would be installed inside the facility. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species. **No impact** would occur.

- b) **Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No Impact. The closest riparian habitats are along the river banks of the Stanislaus River, approximately 0.2 mile south of the project site. This would be sufficiently distant such that the project would not affect the riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities along the river. **No impact** would occur.

- c) **Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

No impact. The location of the new facilities is in an existing building in a currently paved area. No wetlands exist in this location. The project would not adversely affect wetlands as there would be no direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means of disturbing wetlands. **No impact** would occur.

- d) **Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

No impact. The project would be located in an industrial area at an existing facility. The Stanislaus River is located 0.2 mile south of the project site, which is sufficiently distant such that the project would not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. **No impact** would occur.

- e) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

No impact. The project would not require the removal of biological resources, including trees. Therefore, it would not conflict with local policies protecting biological resources. **No impact** would occur.

f) **Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

No impact. As noted above, the project site is located within the boundaries of the SJMSCP, on land designated as Category A/No Pay Zone. This category of land is considered urban land already converted from open space. The project would not conflict with provisions of the SJMSCP, nor would it change the current designation of the project site.

No impact would occur.

1.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. Cultural Resources. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.5.1 Environmental Setting

The region around and including the City of Ripon was previously inhabited by the Miwok tribe before being conquered by the Spanish (City of Ripon 2017). The City was established in 1945 but has history dating back to the 1800s. The first Americans in Ripon were fur trappers in 1826 prior to establishment of farming. The City of Ripon currently does not include any buildings listed on the National Register of Historical Places; however, the Ripon Community Center, located 0.5 mile from the project site, has a California Historic Landmark #436 plaque for New Hope. New Hope was the first known agricultural society in the San Joaquin Valley (City of Ripon 2006a).

1.5.2 Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?

No impact. There are no structures or sites in the City of Ripon listed on the National Register of Historical Places. New Hope, which is located at the Ripon Community Center, is included on the California Historic Landmark list. The project would be located 0.5 mile from the Ripon Community Center and, therefore, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. **No impact** would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Less than significant. The City of Ripon has not publicized the location of any archaeological resources in the area (City of Ripon 2006a). The project would be located on a developed site where no archaeological resources have previously been recorded. No excavation or ground disturbance would be required because equipment would be assembled offsite and then installed within the existing facility. **No impact** would occur.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No impact. The City of Ripon has not identified any unique paleontological resources or geologic features in the area (City of Ripon 2006a). As noted above, no excavation or ground disturbance would be required because equipment would be assembled offsite and then installed within the existing facility; therefore, the project would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. **No impact** would occur.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

No impact. As noted above, no excavation or ground disturbance would be required because equipment would be assembled offsite and then installed within the existing facility; therefore, the project would not disturb human remains. **No impact** would occur.

1.6 ENERGY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.6.1 Environmental Setting

Electricity and natural gas are provided to the Diamond Pet Food Processing Facility by the Modesto Irrigation District (MID) and Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), respectively.

1.6.2 Discussion

A, b) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation; conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Potentially significant. The project would include construction activities and would expand the operation of the existing Diamond Pet Food Processing Facility by 33 percent. This would result in increased fuel and energy use relative to existing conditions. Most energy consumption would result from operation of off-road construction equipment and on-road vehicle trips associated with commutes by construction workers and haul trucks trips. Construction equipment use and associated energy consumption would be typical of that associated with construction of industrial land uses. Idling of on-site equipment during construction would be in accordance with SJVAPCD requirements. Further, on-site construction equipment may include alternatively-fueled vehicles (such as natural gas) where feasible. Finally, the construction contractors would use the best available engineering techniques, construction and design practices, and equipment operating procedures, thereby minimizing the potential for wasteful consumption of fuels and use of energy. Energy efficiency is also expected for the off-site production of construction materials, based on the economic incentive for efficiency.

Because final designs are not yet available, it is unknown what energy efficiency features would be incorporated into the project. Whether the project’s increased fuel and energy use would be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary is currently unknown, and further analysis is required. This impact would be **potentially significant**, and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

1.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Geology and Soils. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.7.1 Environmental Setting

Most of the soils in the City of Ripon planning area are of the sandy loam type, providing good percolation and little erosion and sedimentation. The terrain generally slopes toward the Stanislaus River. (City of Ripon 2006a:2-73.)

No known seismic or geological faults are found in the City of Ripon planning area. The nearest faults are the Tracy-Stockton Fault and a small buried fault that extends south from Banta to Stanislaus County; these faults have no surface trace and have not had any movement over the last three million years. (City of Ripon 2006a:4-4.)

1.7.2 Discussion

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)

Less than significant. The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and the nearest faults (the Tracy-Stockton Fault and a small buried fault that extends south from Banta to Stanislaus County) are located at least 15 miles away (City of Ripon 2006a:4-4). Because surface ground rupture along faults is generally limited to a linear zone a few feet wide, ground rupture because of a fault across the project site is unlikely. Therefore, hazards associated with a potential fault rupture would be **less than significant**.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than significant. If a seismic event occurs at a nearby fault, seismic-induced settlement could affect the project site. The extent of damage would depend on soil characteristics, groundwater depth, and duration and intensity of the earthquake. Potential ground shaking at the project site could expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse impacts. As required by law, the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility conforms to the standards contained within California Building Code (CBC) Title 24, which identifies specific design requirements to reduce damage from strong seismic ground shaking. The project involves installing equipment within and near the existing building, but no new buildings would be constructed. Because the existing facility conforms to applicable CBC regulations and no new buildings would be constructed, potential hazards associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be **less than significant**.

- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than significant. Liquefaction is the sudden temporary loss of strength in saturated, loose to medium dense, granular sediments subjected to ground shaking. Liquefaction can cause foundation failure of buildings and other facilities due to the reduction of foundation bearing strength. During a seismic event, the extent of damage from ground failure including liquefaction would depend on the soil characteristics, groundwater depth, and duration and intensity of the earthquake. Areas with the greatest potential for liquefaction are those in which the water table is less than 20 feet below the ground surface. As mentioned in item ii) above, the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility conforms to CBC Title 24, which identifies specific design requirements to reduce damage from ground failure and liquefaction. Because the existing facility conforms to applicable CBC regulations and no new buildings would be constructed, potential hazards associated with strong ground failure or liquefaction would be minimized. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- iv) Landslides?

No impact. The topography of the project area is relatively flat. Therefore, the project site would not be subject to landslides. **No impact** would occur.

- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No impact. As noted above, most of the soils in the City of Ripon planning area are of the sandy loam type, providing good percolation and little erosion and sedimentation (City of Ripon 2006a:2-73). Because this project involves no ground disturbance, there would be **no impact** related to erosion or loss of topsoil.

- c) **Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?**

Less than significant. The project site is relatively flat and the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility has been designed to meet all applicable CBC Title 14 engineering requirements to ensure that the facility would not be affected by the above geologic hazards. The project involves installing equipment within the existing building, but no new buildings would be constructed. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- d) **Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

Less than significant. Expansive soils are soils that are high in expansive clays or silts and that swell and shrink with wetting and drying, respectively. This shrinking and swelling can result in differential ground movement, which can cause damage to foundations. However, proper fill selection, moisture control, and compaction during construction can prevent these types of soils from causing significant damage.

The existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility has been designed and constructed in conformance with the applicable CBC, which has specific site development and construction standards by soil type to prevent expansive soil hazards. Because the project does not include the construction of new buildings, no significant impacts related to expansive soil hazards would occur. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- e) **Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

No impact. Implementation of the project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

1.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.8.1 Environmental Setting

Certain gases in the earth’s atmosphere, classified as greenhouse gases (GHGs), play a critical role in determining the earth’s surface temperature. GHGs are responsible for “trapping” solar radiation in the earth’s atmosphere, a phenomenon known as the greenhouse effect. Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride.

Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are believed responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and leading to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth’s climate, known as global climate change or global warming. It is “extremely likely” that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the anthropogenic increase in GHG concentrations and other anthropogenic factors together (IPCC 2014). By adoption of Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, and Senate Bill (SB) 97, the State of California has acknowledged that the effects of GHG emissions cause adverse environmental impacts. AB 32 mandates that emissions of GHGs must be capped at 1990 levels by the year 2020.

On January 20, 2017, CARB released its proposed 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update (2017 Scoping Plan Update), which lays out the framework for achieving the 2030 reductions as established in EO B-30-15 and SB 32 and AB 197 (discussed below). The 2017 Scoping Plan Update identifies the GHG reductions needed by emissions sector to achieve a statewide emissions level that is 40 percent below 1990 levels before 2030. It also identifies how GHGs associated with projects could be evaluated under CEQA. Specifically, it states that achieving “no net increase” in GHG emissions is the correct overall objective of projects evaluated under CEQA if conformity with an applicable local GHG reduction plan cannot be demonstrated. CARB also recognizes that it may not be appropriate or feasible for every development project to mitigate its GHG emissions and that this may not necessarily imply a substantial contribution to the cumulatively significant environmental impact of climate change. At the time of writing this environmental checklist, CARB has not yet approved its proposed 2017 Scoping Plan Update.

In August 2016, SB 32 and AB 197 were signed, which serve to extend California’s GHG reduction programs beyond 2020. SB 32 amended the Health and Safety Code to include Section 38566, which contains language to authorize CARB to achieve a statewide GHG emission reduction of at least 40 percent below the AB 32 goal of 1990 levels by 2020 by no later than December 31, 2030. SB 32 codified the targets established by EO B-30-15 for 2030, which set the next interim step in the State’s continuing efforts to pursue the long-term target expressed in EOs S-3-05 and B-30-15 of 80 percent below 1990 emissions levels by 2050.

GHGs have the potential to adversely affect the environment because such emissions contribute, on a cumulative basis, to global climate change. Although the emissions of one single project would not cause global climate change,

GHG emissions from multiple projects throughout the world could result in a cumulative impact with respect to global climate change.

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) guidance does not include a quantitative threshold of significance to use for assessing a project's GHG emissions under CEQA, nor has CARB established such a threshold or recommended a method for setting a threshold for project-level analysis. In the absence of a consistent statewide threshold, a threshold of significance for analyzing a project's GHG emissions was developed. The issue of setting a GHG threshold is complex and dynamic, especially considering the California Supreme Court decision in *Center for Biological Diversity v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife* (referred to hereafter as the Newhall Ranch decision). The California Supreme Court ruling also highlighted the need for the threshold to be tailored to the specific project type, its location, and the surrounding setting. Therefore, the threshold used to analyze the project is specific to the analysis herein, and the City of Ripon retains the ability to develop and/or use different thresholds of significance for other projects in its capacity as lead agency.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has guidance on evaluating GHG emissions for stationary source projects using Best Performance Standards (BPS). SJVAPCD defines BPS as "the most effective Achieved-in-Practice means of reducing or limiting GHG emissions from a GHG emissions source" (SJVAPCD 2009). For stationary sources, BPS refers to equipment type, equipment design, and operational and maintenance activities. Because this project has not committed to using BPS in the project design, GHG emissions must be quantified and disclosed in the CEQA document, per SJVAPCD guidance. For the evaluation of this project, an impact would be significant if the project would not incorporate BPS in stationary sources such that emissions are considered consistent with AB 32, SB 32, and CARB's Scoping Plan.

1.8.2 Discussion

a,b) **Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Potentially significant. The project would include construction activities to expand the operation of the existing pet food production facility by 33 percent. This would result in increased fuel and energy use, which would result in increased GHG emissions. The increased operation would also increase vehicle trips associated with truck deliveries and worker commute trips. This would also generate additional GHG emissions. The level of additional GHG generated by the project is currently unknown, and it is therefore also unknown whether the potential increase in GHG emissions would be considered consistent with AB 32, SB 32, and CARB's Scoping Plan. Further analysis is required. This impact would be **potentially significant**, and this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

1.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.9.1 Environmental Setting

The Diamond Pet Food Processing facility is not listed on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor Database as having previous hazardous materials spills. In the surrounding area, two locations are

listed as having or previously having hazardous materials: Evergreen Environmental Services and Nestle Company. Evergreen Environmental Services, located approximately 1.1 miles from the project site was a hazardous waste facility that was closed in 2002 (DTSC 2017). Nestle Company, located approximately one mile from the project site, had a hazardous materials evaluation completed in 1995; site screening was completed and the site was referred to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) for oversight of soil and groundwater contamination (DTSC 2017).

The Diamond Pet Food Processing Facility currently uses and stores various hazardous materials onsite and maintains and implements a robust emergency response and evacuation plan.

To address the potential for accidents and spills of hazardous materials, the City has entered into an agreement with the Ripon Consolidated Fire District to participate in the Joint County Hazardous Materials Response team. The Ripon Consolidated Fire District maintains adequate numbers of personnel trained to meet the minimum requirements to maintain membership on the team per team policy (City of Ripon 2006a:4-9).

1.9.2 Discussion

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less than significant. Construction activities would involve the use of hazardous materials, such as fuels, lubricants, paints, solvents, gasoline, asphalt, and oil. The use and storage of these materials could potentially expose and adversely affect workers, the public, or the environment as a result of improper handling or use, accident, environmentally unsound disposal methods, or fire, explosion, or other emergencies, resulting in adverse health effects. All allowable uses would be subject to compliance with federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations, and would be monitored by the State (e.g., Cal/OSHA and DTSC), County, and Diamond. Therefore, it is anticipated that the routine use of these materials handled in accordance with these laws and regulations would not create any impacts to the public or the environment. The Diamond Pet Food Processing Facility currently uses and stores various hazardous materials onsite, and maintains and implements a robust emergency response and evacuation plan. With project operation, the proposed fourth production line would not change the types of hazardous materials stored and handled onsite, but would require an increase of approximately 20 percent in the amount of these materials that would be used. Nonetheless, because all hazardous materials would continue to be used and stored in compliance with federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations, this impact would be **less than significant**.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less than significant. As described in (a) above, construction and operation of the project would involve the continued use of hazardous materials onsite. While the types of hazardous materials used and stored onsite would not change, project operation would require an approximately 20-percent increase in use in the amount of these materials. However, use of these materials would continue to be handled in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and, through compliance with existing regulations, would not create any reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions on the public or the environment. Further, Diamond Pet Food Processing Facility maintains and implements a robust emergency response and evacuation plan. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- c) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

No impact. There are no existing or proposed schools located within 0.25 mile of the project. The closest school to the project site is Ripon Elementary School, which is located approximately 1.1 miles northwest of the project site. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- d) **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

Less than significant. As described above, under the Environmental Setting, the Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility is not listed on DTSC's EnviroStor Database as having previous hazardous materials spills. Two locations are listed as having or previously having hazardous materials; however, one site has since been closed and the other site has been referred to the Central Valley RWQCB for oversight (DTSC 2017). Thus, known hazardous materials sites would not be affected during implementation of the project. This impact would be **less than significant**.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No impact. The project would not be located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest airport is the Modesto City-County Airport located 10 miles from the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. **No impact** would occur.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No impact. The project site would not be within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. **No impact** would occur.

- g) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

No impact. The City of Ripon does not have an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; however, Diamond Pet Food Processing Facility maintains and implements a robust emergency response and evacuation plan for the facility. The project would result in **no impact**.

- h) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

No impact. The project would be located within an existing building. No wildlands are located on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the project would have **no impact** related to wildland fire risk.

1.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. Hydrology and Water Quality.				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or offsite flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.10.1 Environmental Setting

The City of Ripon operates its own potable water system using groundwater from two primary aquifers. The city is located in California's Central Valley at the northern end of the San Joaquin Valley (City of Ripon 2006a). Most of the water used in the valley is groundwater. The *City of Ripon General Plan* (2006a) found that "overdraft is not typically a problem in the southern portion of the [groundwater] basin, where Ripon is located."

The City uses four different systems for handling stormwater runoff. Stormwater drainage in the older industrial part of the City west of SR 99 flows into the industrial sewage lines. Another portion is pumped into South San Joaquin Irrigation District lines or canals. The largest portion of the drainage flows by gravity through seven outfalls directly into the Stanislaus River. The commercial area north of SR 99 near Jack Tone Road is collected and taken to a stormwater detention pond. The water can be pumped south into a City gravity storm drainage line in Jack Tone Road that drains into the Stanislaus River. (City of Ripon 2006a:2-73.)

With regards to flooding, the *City of Ripon General Plan* (2006a) lays out where the 100-year floodplain is located along the Stanislaus River. The project site is not located within this floodplain. The city is located approximately 75 miles inland putting it at a low risk for any potential tsunami or seiche waves.

1.10.2 Discussion

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less than significant. The existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility is subject to Wastewater Discharge Requirements from the Regional Water Quality Control Board that prohibit discharging waste to surface waters, discharging hazardous materials, application of residual solids to land areas, discharging domestic wastewater to the industrial system, discharging water classified as 'designated', treatment system bypass, discharging in a different location, and the discharge of toxic substances. Project construction activities involves installation of equipment that would be assembled offsite and would not involve ground disturbance. Therefore, no stormwater-quality-related permits or control measures would be required for construction. Installation of proposed equipment would not violate water quality standards. Project operation is similarly not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. As noted above, the Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility is already subject to Wastewater Discharge Requirements that would remain in effect during project operation. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Less than significant. The existing onsite groundwater well provides water to the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility. Existing groundwater use at the facility is 10,500 gallons per day (gpd). The groundwater is currently treated onsite by reverse osmosis. The project would require an increase of 3,500 gpd in groundwater withdrawal to supply the boiler and the reverse osmosis conditioning cylinders, which is an increase of approximately 33 percent based on existing usage. However, no interference with groundwater recharge would occur because no additional impervious areas would be added. Therefore, a **less-than-significant** impact would occur.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation?

No impact. The project would not change the existing drainage patterns of the site or area, and would not result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation. There would be **no impact**.

- d) **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or offsite flooding?**

No impact. The project would not alter any streams or rivers, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff. **No impact** would occur.

- e) **Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

Less than significant. The project would not add impervious surface areas to the project site, and the amount of stormwater runoff is expected to be similar to existing conditions. The four stormwater drainage systems laid out by the *City of Ripon General Plan (2006a)* flow by gravity through seven discharge points into the Stanislaus River. This helps to prevent any overflow. The project would not increase stormwater runoff and would not contribute to an exceedance of the City's stormwater system capacity.

As noted under a) above, because installation of the equipment involves no ground disturbance, no stormwater-quality-related permits or control measures would be required for construction. Installation of proposed equipment would not violate water quality standards or otherwise result in substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. As noted above, the Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility is already subject to Wastewater Discharge Requirements that would remain in effect during project operation. As a result, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- f) **Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

Less than significant. As described above, under a) and e) project construction would require no ground disturbance, and would not substantially degrade water quality. Diamond is compliant with their current water discharge requirements designed to help prevent degradation of water quality. The project would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.

- g) **Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

No impact. The project would not include the construction of housing. Further, the existing facility is not located within the 100-year floodplain. **No impact** would occur.

- h) **Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?**

No impact. The project includes installation of equipment within an existing building. The existing facility is not located within the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the installation of the new equipment would not impede or redirect flood flows. **No impact** would occur.

- i) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

No impact. The project would be constructed at an existing facility and would not be located close to a levee or dam. Therefore, the project would not create any additional risk of flooding. **No impact** would occur.

- j) **Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

No impact. Inundation of the project by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow has a low potential of occurring due to the project location in an inland (approximately 75 miles from the coast) area and the limited number and size of open water bodies nearby. Ripon is located in the Valley and is relatively flat reducing the risk of inundation by mudflow. **No impact** would occur.

1.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.11.1 Environmental Setting

The *City of Ripon General Plan (2006a)* designates the project site as Heavy Industrial. The Heavy Industrial land use designation applies to manufacturing, processing, assembling, research, wholesale and storage uses, trucking terminals, railroad and freight stations, public and quasi-public uses, and similar and compatible uses.

The City of Ripon zoning map (2006b) identifies the project site zoning as M2 (Heavy Industrial) and RC (Resource Conservation). The northern portion of the project site containing the buildings, parking areas, and driveways is zoned Heavy Industrial, while the southern portion of the project site containing the evaporation ponds and other undeveloped areas is zoned Resource Conservation. The Heavy Industrial district is intended to provide for the continuation and development of heavy manufacturing industries in locations where the use will be compatible with and not adversely impact adjacent land uses. The purposes of the Resource Conservation district are to conserve and protect the natural resources along the Stanislaus River within the City’s boundaries, provide maximum public access to River resources, achieve a visually pleasing and compatible relationship between urban development and the natural environment, and provide appropriate standards and criteria for reviewing proposals for recreation or other development.

1.11.2 Discussion

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The project would involve the addition of a forth production line at the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility. The project site is surrounded by industrial land uses to the north, SR 99 to the east, the Stanislaus River to the south, and undeveloped land to the west. Oak Grove Park is located to the southwest and residential areas are located further to the north, on either side of SR 99. No existing communities would be physically divided by the project. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- b) **Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

No impact. The project site is designated Heavy Industrial by the *City of Ripon General Plan (2006a)* and is zoned Heavy Industrial and Resource Conservation (City of Ripon 2006b). The project would be consistent with the existing land use designations and zoning and all applicable policies, including those related to environmental protection. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- c) **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

No impact. As described in Section 1.4, "Biological Resources," the project site lies within the boundaries of the SJMSCP, on land designated as Category A/No Pay Zone. This category of land is considered urban land already converted from open space. The project would not conflict with provisions of the SJMSCP, nor would it change the current designation of the project site. **No impact** would occur.

1.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. Mineral Resources. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.12.1 Environmental Setting

The *San Joaquin County General Plan* (1992) indicates that the project area does not contain any state or locally designated mineral resources. While no mineral resource sites are specifically identified in the *City of Ripon General Plan* (2006a), Policy D3 directs that “projects in the vicinity of the Stanislaus River should be referred to the California Department of Conservation for comment with regard to mineral resources in conjunction with project CEQA reviews.”

1.12.2 Discussion

- a) **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

No impact. Because the project site is currently developed with an operating industrial use and because the project site does not contain any state or locally designated mineral resources, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- b) **Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?**

No impact. There are no locally important mineral resource recovery sites delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan that include the project site. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

1.13 NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.Noise. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.13.1 Environmental Setting

Noise levels are typically discussed as A-weighted decibel (dBA), a sound level scale that includes the frequencies of sound to which the human ear is most sensitive. Decibels are a unit of measurement indicating the relative amplitude or intensity of a sound. Noise can be described in a number of ways. Typically, community noise levels are described as 24-hour noise levels that add penalties for the noise-sensitive times of the day. These include the community equivalent noise level (CNEL) and the day-night (L_{dn}) noise level. Other noise descriptors are used to describe short-term noise events such as the average noise level (L_{eq}) over a given period of time or the instantaneous maximum noise level (L_{max}).

The intensity of a sound and the subjective noisiness or loudness is related as is the intensity of a sound and a sensitive receptor’s distance to that sound. Noise from construction activities and stationary sources is considered a “point source” of noise. Sound from this type of source radiates uniformly outward in a spherical pattern. The rate at which noise typically dissipates from a point source is 6 to 7.5 dBA for each doubling of the distance, depending on the ground absorption, atmospheric conditions, and other shielding factors. Traffic noise appears to be from a line rather than a point as the vehicles are moving and the noise spreads cylindrically rather than spherically. The rate at

which traffic noise generally dissipates is 3 to 4.5 dBA for each doubling of the distance, depending on other shielding factors.

EXISTING NOISE ENVIRONMENT

Noise in the City of Ripon is primarily from vehicular traffic and railroad operations, with some noise from aircraft operations. Within the City, the major sources of existing noise are the traffic along SR 99 and the train operations on Union Pacific Railroad. Roadway noise on other major routes also contribute to the community noise levels. Noise more than 65 day-night average level (L_{dn}) along most local streets and roads is within street rights-of-way (City of Ripon 2006a:4-11.)

Existing noise sources at the Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility include pumps, compressors, fans, air dryers, standby generators, loading docks, and vehicle traffic, which is typical of a food processing plant.

Noise-sensitive land uses include Oak Grove Park, which is located approximately 0.5 mile southwest of the project site, and residential areas located approximately 0.3 mile to the north, on both sides of SR 99. The closest school to the project site is Ripon Elementary School, which is located approximately 1.1 miles northwest of the project site.

CITY OF RIPON MUNICIPAL CODE

The maximum allowable noise standards for the City of Ripon are shown in Table 1.13-1.

Table 1.13-1 Maximum Allowable Exterior Noise Levels

Receiving Land Use Category	Time Period	Maximum Exterior Noise Level (dBA)
Single and limited multiple family	10 p.m. to 7 a.m.	50
	7 a.m. to 10 p.m.	60
Multiple family, public institutional and neighborhood commercial	10 p.m. to 7 a.m.	55
	7 a.m. to 10 p.m.	60
Medium and heavy commercial	10 p.m. to 7 a.m.	60
	7 a.m. to 10 p.m.	65
Light Industrial	Anytime	70
Heavy Industrial	Anytime	75

Source: Chapter 16.156, Performance Standards, of the City of Ripon Municipal Code

1.13.2 Discussion

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?
- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

The following discussion addresses items a), c), and d).

Short-Term Construction Source Noise

Less than significant. Construction noise typically occurs intermittently and changes during construction phases (e.g., demolition/land clearing, grading and excavation, building construction). Typical noise levels for individual pieces of construction equipment range from approximately 80 to 85 dBA at 50 feet (U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration 2006). Project construction would generate noise and temporarily increase noise levels on the project site. Construction activities would involve the use of typical construction equipment, such as a crane, forklifts, welding machines, generators, and hand tools. Potential increased noise from construction would be temporary and would cease once the project is complete (approximately 10 months). Construction would occur inside the existing building, which would substantially reduce the potential for substantial increase in exterior noise levels. As proposed, all exterior construction activities (primarily equipment movement and staging) would take place between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and (if needed) between 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday.

Depending on the activities performed and equipment usage requirements, combined average-hourly noise levels at construction sites typically range from approximately 65 to 89 dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1971). Assuming a maximum construction noise level of 89 dBA L_{eq} and an average attenuation rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source, noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptors—residential areas located approximately 0.3 mile to the north on both sides of SR 99—would not exceed 60 dBA L_{eq} , which is the City's maximum exterior noise level for residential land uses during the day (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.). Therefore, short-term construction noise would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of applicable standards. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Long-Term Operational Noise

Less than significant. Existing noise associated with current operation of the Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility includes pumps, compressors, fans, air dryers, standby generators, loading docks, and vehicle traffic, which is typical of a food processing plant. Operation of the proposed fourth production line would require eight additional employees and, therefore, would generate additional employee vehicle trips. With the addition of the fourth production line, the number of both truck and rail deliveries would increase, resulting in increased noise from truck and rail traffic. However, when considering increases in noise, it takes a doubling of the noise source to result in a perceptible (i.e., 3 dB) increase in noise. Eight additional employees would not result in a doubling in traffic on any associated roadways and, therefore, would not result in an audible increase in traffic noise.

Regarding new stationary noise sources, the proposed additional production line would operate in a similar fashion to the existing three production lines and would be expected to generate the same types and levels of noise as the existing equipment. Similar to the discussion above for traffic noise, a doubling of the noise source would be required to result in an audible increase in noise. The addition of one production line, and associated noise sources, to the existing three production lines would not result in a doubling of the noise sources or an audible increase in noise. Further, the production line and associated equipment would be completely enclosed within the facility walls, similar to current operations. The additional production line would not result in an audible increase in traffic or stationary noise over existing conditions. Therefore, the project's long-term operations would not result in the exposure of people to additional long-term operational noise levels, and additional noise would not exceed the applicable City noise standards. This impact would be **less than significant**.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less than significant. Project construction may result in varying degrees of temporary groundborne vibration and noise, depending on the specific construction equipment used and activities involved. It is expected that the highest levels of groundborne vibration and noise levels associated with the project would be generated by trucks and railcars used to deliver materials to and from the project site, both during construction and long-term project operation. As described in items a), c), and d), above, the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility is located in an industrial area with noise and vibration levels typical of industrial land uses. While the project would increase the number of trucks and railcars entering and exiting the project site, this is an existing noise and vibration source.

Further, the project site is located sufficiently distant from the nearest sensitive receptors (0.3 mile away, with SR 99 separating the residential and industrial land uses), such that any increased noise and vibration levels from project construction and operation would not be discernable from existing noise and vibration levels. Thus, the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive groundborne noise or vibration levels. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No impact. The project would not be located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The closest airport is the Modesto City-County Airport located 10 miles from the project site. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with airports. **No impact** would occur.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No impact. This project site would not be within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels associated with private airstrips. **No impact** would occur.

1.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Population and Housing. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing homes, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.14.1 Environmental Setting

The City of Ripon’s population in 2010 was approximately 14,297 (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). California Department of Finance (2018) estimates that the 2018 population of Ripon is 15,847. No houses are located on or adjacent to the project site, which is surrounded by industrial land. The nearest residences are located approximately 0.3 mile north of the project site on both sides of SR 99.

1.14.2 Discussion

- a) **Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

Less than significant. The project would require up to eight new employees to operate the expanded Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility. Project construction would occur over a 10-month period for installation of the Line Four processing equipment and would require 15 construction workers per day. It is assumed that new employees and temporary construction workers would be local residents and would not induce growth in the project area, either directly or indirectly. Because the increase in employees would be minimal compared to the available labor pool, the project would have a **less-than-significant** impact on population growth.

- b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing homes, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No impact. The project would be located at the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility. No existing homes would be removed or displaced by the project’s construction or operational activities. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- c) **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No impact. As described in item b) above, the project would be located at the existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility, which is in an industrial area. The project would not displace people or require the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

1.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Public Services. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.15.1 Environmental Setting

The Ripon Consolidated Fire District covers an area of approximately 55 square miles, of which approximately 3.5 square miles is within the city limits. The Ripon Consolidated Fire District has three stations and 11 paramedic/EMT firefighters, as well as a fire chief, fire inspector, and administrative staff (Ripon Consolidated Fire District 2017). The nearest fire station to the project site is located at 142 S. Stockton Avenue, approximately 0.5 mile from the project site.

The Ripon Police Department is located at 259 N. Wilma Avenue, approximately 1.3 miles from the project site. The City’s police force includes approximately 23 sworn police officers and two community service officers (Ripon Police Department 2017).

The closest school to the project site is Ripon Elementary School, which is located approximately 1.1 miles northwest of the project site. Oak Grove Park is the nearest recreational facility and is approximately 0.5 mile southwest of the project site.

1.15.2 Discussion

- a) **Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities?

Less than significant. The proposed Line Four would be located inside an existing facility that is currently provided applicable public services and would not increase the demand for these services to serve the facility. As stated in Section 1.14, "Population and Housing," the project would require up to eight new employees to operate the expanded Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility. Project construction would occur over a 10-month period for installation of the Line Four processing equipment and would require 15 construction workers per day. It is assumed that these workers would be local residents who would not increase the demand for public services nor generate the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. Therefore, the project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to public services.

1.16 RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. Recreation. Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.16.1 Environmental Setting

No recreational facilities or activities are located on or adjacent to the project site. Oak Grove Park is the nearest recreational facility and is approximately 0.5 mile southwest of the project site.

1.16.2 Discussion

- a) **Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

Less than significant. As stated in Section 1.14, "Population and Housing," the project would require up to eight new employees to operate the expanded Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility. It is assumed that these workers would be local residents who would not increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- b) **Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

No impact. As described in item a) above, there would be minimal new employment opportunities and no new residential land uses that would increase demand for recreational facilities to the extent that new or expanded recreational facilities would be required. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

1.17 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.17.1 Environmental Setting

Regional access to the project site is provided by SR 99, which extends in a north-south direction through San Joaquin County and contains six lanes in the City of Ripon. Main Street and South Stockton Road provide direct access to the project site. The roads are paved leading to the facility, which is located in a heavy industrial area. Jack Tone Road, located approximately one mile from the project site, is the city's main connection to the freeway (City of Ripon 2006a).

According to the City's General Plan (City of Ripon 2006a), Ripon has little in the way of traffic congestion. Most streets have plenty of capacity, and peak hours are not a serious issue. The heaviest amount of congestion is at SR 99

especially during peak commute periods; the State Route 99/Jack Tone Road interchange; and Colony and Santos intersections where heavy truck traffic leads to delays.

The Union Pacific Railroad runs parallel to SR 99. The main route through the San Joaquin Valley runs directly through the City of Ripon (City of Ripon 2006a). Most of the development around the railroad is commercial or industrial. According to the *City of Ripon General Plan* (2006a), roughly 16 to 18 trains operate per day. Each train consists of about three locomotives, 80 cars, and travels at speeds up to 60 miles per hour.

The Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility generates traffic related to staff commuting to and from work, deliveries of raw materials to the facility, and the shipping of product from the facility. Deliveries to the facility are made by truck and rail; shipments from the facility are made by truck. Raw material deliveries to the facility currently require 114 trucks and 19 railcars per week. Product deliveries from the facility require 190 trucks per week. Delivery locomotive to the facility requires 19 locomotives per week.

1.17.2 Discussion

- a) **Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?**

Potentially significant. Construction and operation of the fourth production line would generate additional traffic associated with construction workers, additional Diamond employees, and delivery trucks. Additional evaluation is needed to determine if the project could conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy related to transportation system performance. Therefore, this impact would be **potentially significant**, and this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

- b) **Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Potentially significant. See discussion under a) above. Additional evaluation is needed to determine potential conflicts with an applicable congestion management program. Therefore, this impact would be **potentially significant**, and this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

- c) **Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

No impact. The closest airport to the project site is the Modesto City-County Airport, located ten miles from the project site. The project does not propose any uses that could have an effect on air traffic patterns. There would not be an increase in existing building height to interfere with any air traffic. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

- d) **Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

No impact. The project would be located at an existing facility and would not require construction of new roads or design features. Construction and delivery traffic would use existing roads and driveways to access the site. **No impact** would occur.

e) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

No impact. Construction-related equipment and vehicles would park at the project site and would not block roadways or result in inadequate emergency access. Emergency access would be maintained during project construction and operation. **No impact** would occur.

f) **Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?**

No impact. Project construction and operation would not result in the removal of, or need for, alternative transportation facilities such as bus turnouts or bicycle racks. The project would be located in an industrial area and it is expected that the eight new employees would travel to the project site primarily in personal vehicles, consistent with existing employee travel behavior. Therefore, the project would not generate need for alternative transportation facilities and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. **No impact** would occur.

1.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p>				
<p>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1.18.1 Environmental Setting

Assembly Bill (AB) 52, signed by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., in September 2014, established a new class of resources under CEQA: “tribal cultural resources” (TCRs). AB 52, as provided in PRC Sections 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, and 21082.3, requires that lead agencies undertaking CEQA review must, upon written request of a California Native American Tribe, begin consultation once the lead agency determines that the application for the project is complete, prior to the issuance of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an environmental impact report (EIR) or notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration.

AB 52 applies to those projects for which a lead agency had issued a NOP of an EIR or notice of intent to adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration on or after July 1, 2015. Therefore, the requirements of AB 52 apply and the City of Ripon has initiated consultation with Tribes that have requested consultation. The City is not currently aware of any TCRs that exist in the vicinity of the project.

1.18.2 Discussion

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?

No impact. It is possible that consultation with tribes pursuant to AB 52 could identify TCRs in the project vicinity. However, the project does not include ground disturbance and involves installation of equipment inside an existing facility. Although TCRs may be identified, such resources would not be substantially affected by the project. **No impact** would occur.

- b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

No impact. See discussion under a) above. Although TCRs may be identified during the AB 52 consultation process, the project does not include ground-disturbing activities, and equipment would be located inside an existing structure. **No impact** would occur.

1.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.19.1 Environmental Setting

Existing water demands at the Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility are met by Diamond's onsite groundwater well. Existing groundwater use at the facility is 10,500 gpd. The groundwater is currently treated onsite by reverse osmosis.

Wastewater at the facility is produced from the wash-down of the reverse osmosis cylinders and from the peaker power plant east of the facility. The wastewater is treated onsite by Diamond's clarifier and evaporation ponds, all of which are permitted by the regional water quality control board (RWQCB).

The Central Valley RWQCB (2012) dictated Waste Discharge Requirements for the Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility when the facility opened in 2013. The Central Valley RWQCB laid out what Diamond would be using their water for, including how many gallons would be used compared to the paper mill that previously operated on the project site. The existing Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility generates an average of 9,000 gpd of wastewater while the maximum capacity of the system is 12,000 gpd. The groundwater for dilution average for the existing facility

is 365,760 gpd. The total influent of water for the existing facility is 701,100 gpd and the maximum flow rate is 956,130 gpd.

Solid waste generated by the project would be disposed of at Foothill Sanitary Landfill (in Linden, CA) or recycled at an appropriate facility. Based on the current permit, Foothill Sanitary Landfill is projected to be in operation until 2082; average daily volume at the landfill is 566 tons (San Joaquin County 2017).

1.19.2 Discussion

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less than significant. Wastewater at the facility is produced from the wash-down of the reverse osmosis cylinders and from the peaker power plant east of the facility. As noted above, the existing facility generates an average of 9,000 gpd of wastewater while the maximum capacity of the system is 12,000 gpd. The project would result in an incremental increase in wastewater generation amounting to approximately 1,600 gpd, which is an increase of approximately 13 percent based on the maximum capacity of the system. There would be no increase in wastewater from the peaker plant. Similar to existing operating conditions, the project's wastewater would be treated onsite by Diamond's clarifier and evaporation ponds. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Valley RWQCB. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No impact. The existing Diamond facility uses and treats onsite groundwater for potable purposes. As discussed in Section 1.10, "Hydrology and Water Quality," the project would result in a minor increase in water use, which would be provided by available onsite groundwater. Further, as discussed under a) above, the Diamond facility treats wastewater onsite and the incremental increase in wastewater would not require upgrades to existing treatment facilities. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No impact. The project site contains stormwater drainage and erosion features that drain runoff from incidental rainfall. Surface runoff from the Diamond facility currently drains into two existing, onsite retention basins. The project site is relatively flat and a large portion of the 157-acre property is composed of impervious surfaces. The project includes installation of the fourth production line inside the existing facility. No increase in stormwater rate or volume would result. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less than significant. Existing water demands at the Diamond Pet Foods Processing Facility are met by Diamond's onsite groundwater well. Existing groundwater use at the facility is 10,500 gpd. The groundwater is currently treated onsite by reverse osmosis. The project would require 3,500 gpd in groundwater withdrawal to supply the boiler and the reverse osmosis conditioning cylinders, which is an increase of approximately 33 percent based on existing usage; however, no new or expanded entitlements would be needed. This impact would be **less than significant**.

- e) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

Less than significant. As discussed in item a), above, the project would result in an incremental increase in wastewater generation amounting to approximately 1,600 gpd, which is an increase of approximately 13 percent based on the maximum capacity of the system. The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Valley RWQCB, nor would it exceed the capacity of the onsite wastewater treatment system. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- f) **Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

Less than significant. Construction activities would generate small amounts of waste that may require off-site disposal. Non-hazardous waste generated during construction would include common household trash, cardboard, wood pallets, copper wire, scrap metal and wood wire spools, and packaging materials for equipment and parts. All solid waste generated during construction would be collected and disposed or recycled by the contractor at Foothill Sanitary Landfill (in Linden, CA), and any hazardous waste would be disposed of off-site in accordance with all applicable laws pertaining to the handling and disposal of hazardous waste.

Operation of the project would generate solid waste through the processing of pet food products, and would incrementally increase the facility's current generation of solid waste (with the addition of the fourth production line). Waste generated during project operation would be collected and disposed of or recycled in accordance with state and federal laws.

It is not anticipated that the amount of solid waste generated by the project would exceed the capacity of Foothill Sanitary Landfill, which is projected to be in operation until 2082 based on the current permit; average daily volume at the landfill is 566 tons (San Joaquin County 2017). Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

- g) **Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

Less than significant. Disposal of the solid waste generated by the project at the Foothill Sanitary Landfill (in Linden, CA) or at an appropriate recycling facility would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. Therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

1.20 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. Mandatory Findings of Significance.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083, 21083.5.

Reference: Government Code Sections 65088.4.

Public Resources Code Sections 21080, 21083.5, 21095; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

1.20.1 Discussion

- a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

No impact. As described above in Section 1.4, “Biological Resources,” the project site is currently developed with an existing industrial use. The project includes installation of equipment, which does not require ground-disturbing activities. In addition, the equipment would be installed in an existing building. **No impact** to wildlife species and populations would occur.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Potentially Significant. As discussed in various sections of this Initial Study, the project could result in potentially significant impacts related to air quality/odors, energy use, GHG emissions, and traffic. Depending on the level of project impacts, it is possible that project impacts could contribute to cumulative impacts associated with other projects. This impact would be **potentially significant** and will be analyzed further in the EIR.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant. As discussed in various sections of this Initial Study, the project could result in **potentially significant** impacts related to air quality/odors and GHG emissions, which could result in direct or indirect impacts to human beings. These issues will be analyzed further in the EIR.

REFERENCES

- California Air Resources Board. 2015. Area Designations Maps/State and National. Available: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm>. Accessed September 24, 2015.
- . 2017. Area Designations for National and State Air Quality Standards. California Air Resources Board, Air Quality Planning Branch.
- California Department of Finance 2018. Report E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State. Available: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-1/>. Accessed August 30, 2018.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2017. *Envirostor*. Available: <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed August 8, 2017.
- California Department of Transportation. 2011. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. San Joaquin County. Available: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/sjoaquin.htm. Accessed June 2017.
- Caltrans. See California Department of Transportation.
- CARB. See California Air Resources Board.
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2012 (August 31). Order No. 5-00-075 – Waste Discharge Requirements for Diamond Pet Food Processors of Ripon, LLC and Ripon Cogeneration, LLC, Diamond Pet Food Ripon Facility, San Joaquin County.
- Central Valley RWQCB. See Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- City of Ripon. 2006a. *City of Ripon General Plan*. Adopted September 19, 2006. Available: http://www.cityofripon.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_1080027/File/City%20Hall/City%20Government/Documents/Development/General%20Plan%202040%20Chapters.pdf. Accessed June 2017.
- . 2006b (September 19). City of Ripon Zone Districts. Available: http://www.cityofripon.org/city_hall/city_government/forms_and_documents. Accessed October 16, 2018.
- . 2017. "History." *City of Ripon: The Jewel of the Valley*. Available: http://www.cityofripon.org/residents/around_ripon/history/. Accessed August 2017.
- DTSC. See California Department of Toxic Substances Control.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2014. Climate Change 2014 Synthesis Report Summary for Policymakers.
- IPCC. See Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
- Ripon Consolidated Fire District. 2017. Personnel/Staff Overview. Available: <http://www.riponfire.com/>. Accessed June 2017.
- Ripon Police Department. 2017. Police Units. Available: <http://www.riponpd.org/>. Accessed June 2017.
- San Joaquin Council of Governments. 2000 (November 14). *San Joaquin County Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP)*. Prepared by a consortium of local, state and federal agencies.
- San Joaquin County. 1992. *San Joaquin County General Plan*. Adopted July 29, 1992. Available: <https://www.sjgov.org/commdev/cgi-bin/cdyn.exe?grp=planning&htm=generalplan>. Accessed June 2017.
- . 2017. Foothill Sanitary Landfill Facility. Available: <https://www.sjgov.org/solidwaste/dynamic?id=22997>. Accessed November 2017.
- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. 2009. District Policy: Addressing GHG Emission Impacts for Stationary Source Projects Under CEQA When Serving as the Lead Agency.
- SJVAPCD. See San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. 2010 Census Interactive Population Search. Available:
<https://www.census.gov/2010census/popmap/ipmtext.php?fl=06:0661026>. Accessed June 2017.
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. 2006 (January). *FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide*. Final Report.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1971. *Noise from Construction Equipment, Building Equipment and Home Appliances*.

This page intentionally left blank.